FILED
OCT 6 1943
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1943

No. 412

HAROLD KRAMER,

Appellant,

vs.

STATE OF OHIO.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO.

STATEMENT AGAINST JURISDICTION AND MOTION BY APPELLEE TO DISMISS OR AFFIRM.

FRANK T. CULLITAN,
Prosecuting Attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio;
SAUL S. DANACEAU,
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney,
Criminal Courts Building,
Cleveland, Ohio,
Counsel for Appellee.

INDEX.

Subject Index.

	Page
Statement opposing jurisdiction	1
Motion to dismiss or affirm	3
Memorandum in support of statement opposing jurisdiction and motion to dismiss or affirm	5
History of the case	5
The statute	6
The affidavit	8
Facts	9
Argument	15

Table of Cases Cited.

Douglas v. *Noble*, 261 U. S. 165	16
Kramer v. *Ohio*, 141 O. S. 667	6
Semler v. *Oregon State Board of Dental Examiners*, 294 U. S. 608	16

Statutes Cited.

General Code of Ohio:	
Section 1329	6
Section 1329-1	8

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

No. 29,567

HAROLD KRAMER,

Appellant,

vs.

STATE OF OHIO,

Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO.

STATEMENT AGAINST THE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Now comes appellee, State of Ohio, and says that the questions on which the decision of this cause depends are so unsubstantial as not to need further argument and that it is manifest that the appeal taken by appellant is for delay only. In support and explanation thereof there is filed herewith a Motion to Dismiss or Affirm, supported by memorandum.

FRANK T. CULLITAN,
Prosecuting Attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio,
By/and SAUL S. DANACEAU,
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney,
Attorneys for Appellee.